

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-34 remain in the application as amended herein, and claims 35-66 are added. Accordingly, claims 1-66 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 1-34 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 8-15 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishikawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,652). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over Ishikawa.

The Ishikawa patent describes a radio communication system in which peer-to-peer communication is carried out between two PHS terminals that are respectively assigned to different base stations. The information necessary to carry out the peer-to-peer communication, such as the system calling code, is stored in an ID chip inserted in a slot located at the bottom of the housing of the PHS terminal and may be copied from the ID chip into an internal memory of the terminal. To transfer the information from one PHS terminal to another PHS terminal, the information is copied from the internal memory of the first terminal into an ID chip inserted in the first terminal, the ID chip is then removed from the first terminal and inserted in the slot of the second terminal. The second terminal may then access the information directly from the ID chip or may copy the information into its internal memory. (See Figs. 1-3, 9A-9B and 10A-10C; col. 2, lines 12-27; col. 5, lines 14-46; col. 7, lines 42-51; and col. 8, line 66 - col. 9, line 24). Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest establishing an electrical connection between the two PHS terminals.

Nevertheless, the Examiner contends that "the electrical connection is done [through] radio waves". However, as a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art would clearly understand, the transmission of radio waves between two terminals is *not an electrical connection* between the terminals. Ishikawa shows, in Fig. 1, that the radio waves are transmitted between the terminal and the base station or between two terminals *through the atmosphere*. The patent does not disclose or suggest that the radio waves are carried, e.g., over a direct wire path between the two devices. Moreover, radio waves are electromagnetic waves of a frequency used for radio communication. There is no movement of, e.g., charge carriers between the two devices. Therefore, Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest an electrical connection.

Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest:

establishing an electrical connection between a first device and a second device

as called for in claim 1.

Further, because Ishikawa describes the transfer of the information from one terminal to another *by copying the information* from one terminal onto an ID chip and then *transferring the ID chip* from that terminal to another terminal, the patent does not suggest sending the information *via an electrical connection*.

Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest:

sending the communication specification information from the first device to the second device via the electrical connection

as defined in claim 1.

It follows that Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest the combination recited in claim 1 and thus does not anticipate the claim.

Claims 2-4 and 8-11 depend from claim 1, and each further defines and limits the invention set out in the independent claim. It follows that each of claims 2-4 and 8-11 defines a combination that is patentably distinguishable over Ishikawa for at least the same reasons.

Additionally regarding claim 8, the Examiner contends that the base station shown in Fig. 1 is a "relay station". Ishikawa, however, describes *radio communication* between the PHS terminal and the base station which, in turn, is physically connected to a communication network. The patent does not suggest the sending of communication specification information from a first device to a second device via a first electrical connection, the relay station, and a *second electrical connection*.

Independent claim 12 calls for:

a second device having a second connector, said second connector being detachably coupled to said first connector to form an electrical connection between said first device and said second device[.]

As noted above, Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest an *electrical connection* between two PHS terminals or between a PHS terminal and a base station. Also, Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest a connector that is *detachably coupled* to another connector.

Claim 12 also recites:

a sending unit operable to send the communication specification information from said first device to said second device via the electrical connection.

For the reasons described above regarding the sending step of claim 1, Ishikawa does not suggest such a sending unit.

Claims 13-15 and 19-22 depend from claim 12 and are distinguishable over Ishikawa at least for the same reasons. Additionally, claim 19 includes limitations similar to those set

out in claim 8, and is further distinguishable over the reference for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also rejected claims 5-6, 16-17, 23-28 and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa in view of Maggenti (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052214). (Though the Office Action refers to claims 5-16, it is understood that the Examiner intended to reject claims 5-6 as no arguments are provided for rejecting claims 7-15.) It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 5-6 depend from claim 1, and claims 16-17 depend from claim 12. Therefore, each of claims 5-6 and 16-17 are distinguishable over Ishikawa for at least the same reasons. Moreover, independent claim 23 defines a computer-readable recording medium recorded with a program for carrying out the method of claim 1 and is thus distinguishable over Ishikawa at least for the same reasons. Also, claims 24-28 and 30-33 depend from claim 23 and are thus distinguishable over Ishikawa for at least the same reasons.

The Maggenti publication describes a wireless push-to-talk system, also known as a net broadcast service (NBS), formed of communication devices which communicate with each other under the control of a communications manager. Only one communication device may transmit at a time, and the device must first request transmission privilege from the communications manager in order to transmit. Each communication device maintains a list of groups in which the communication device can participate and also stores the network address of each group. The communication device initially obtains the network addresses by either: (1) being initially provided with the address of a default server that can deliver the current

list of groups in which the communication device can participate, (2) being initially provided with a group list which includes at least one network address of a group in which the communication device is a member, or (3) having the network addresses entered by a user. (See Fig. 2; and paragraphs [0007], [0031]-[0036], and [0100]-[0105]). The publication does not suggest that the addresses are sent from one communication device to another communication device *via an electrical connection*, and therefore Maggenti does not remedy the deficiencies of Ishikawa.

Therefore, neither Ishikawa nor Maggenti, whether taken alone or in combination, suggests the methods defined in claims 5-6, the systems defined in claims 16-17 or the recording media defined in claims 23-28 and 30-33. It follows that each of claims 5-6, 16-17, 23-28 and 30-33 are patentably distinguishable over the references.

The Examiner also rejected claims 7, 18, 29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa in view of Palvianen (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,005). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1, claim 18 depends from claim 12, and claim 29 depends from claim 23. Therefore, each of claims 7, 18 and 29 are distinguishable over Ishikawa for at least the same reasons. Further, independent claim 34 is directed to a method that includes limitations called for in claims 1 and 7, and therefore claim 34 is distinguishable over Ishikawa for at least the same reasons.

The Palvianen patent describes the secure access of a data network via the telephone network. A closed user group of subscribers is provided that permits calls originating from inside the user group to reach the access point of the data network but which prevents calls originating from outside the

user group to reach the access point. Information concerning the access point of the data network and the members of the closed user group are stored in the home location register (HLR) and the visitor location register (VLR) of the mobile switching centers of the telephone network. The mobile switching stations also receive calls requesting access to closed user groups from mobile stations and determine whether the mobile stations have the right to access the requested closed user groups. (See Figs. 1 and 4-6; col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 29; col. 5, lines 17-29; and col. 5, line 45 - col. 6, line 2). The patent does not disclose or suggest that information concerning the closed user group is sent from the mobile switching center to the mobile station and does not disclose or suggest that such information is sent from the mobile switching center to the mobile station via an electrical connection. Therefore, Palvianen does not remedy the deficiencies of Ishikawa.

Neither Ishikawa nor Palvianen, whether taken alone or in combination, suggests the methods defined in claims 7 and 34, the system defined in claim 18, or the computer-readable recording medium defined in claim 29. It follows that each of claims 7, 18, 29 and 34 are patentably distinguishable over the references.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

New claims 35-41 depend from claim 1, new claims 42-51 depend from claim 12, and new claims 52-58 depend from claim 23. Therefore, new claims 35-59 are distinguishable over the cited references at least for the reasons described above. Support for these claims is found, e.g., in Figs. 2, 5-7 and 10-20 and on pages 9-61 of the specification.

New claim 59 is directed to a device having limitations similar to those of the first device defined in

claim 12. Claim 59 is therefore distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

New claims 60-66 depend from claim 59 and are also distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. Moreover, new claims 60-64 include limitations similar to those set out in claims 13-17, and new claims 65-66 include limitations similar to those set out in new claim 42-43. Therefore, each of new claims 59-66 are similarly supported by the disclosure.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 13, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicants